

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignnia 22313-1450 www.urpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/834,228	04/12/2001	Elaine L. Jacobson	NIAD-214.1 US	3352	
24972 75	90 05/07/2003				
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP			EXAMINER		
666 FIFTH AVE NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198			HUI, SAN	HUI, SAN MING R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1617		
			DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003		
				16	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/834,228	JACOBSON ET AL.			
, .a., .e., , , .e., .e.,	Examin r	Art Unit			
	San-ming Hui	1617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 07 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a			
	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire learned on the control of the control o	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) 🗌 they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See attachement</u> .					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment			
.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See attachment</u> .					
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a) \boxtimes will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided below	☐ will be entered and an wor appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: None.					
Claim(s) objected to: None.		•			
Claim(s) rejected: 30-37.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disappr	oved by the Examiner.			
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. ☐ Other:		SREENI PADMANABHAN PRIMARY EXAMINER 2 03			

Application/Control Number: 09/834,228

Art Unit: 1617

ADVISORY ACTION

Continuation of 2):

The proposed amendments filed April 7, 2003 will not be entered as it will raised new issues and consideration for the Office. The proposed amendments filed April 7, 2003 will obviate the rejections under 35 USC 102(b) set forth in the previous office action. However, for the claims 31-33, the limitations were not addressed in the rejections under 35 USC 103 set forth in the previous office action mailed November 20, 2002. Because of this reason, the proposed amendments will necessitate a further consideration and a change of ground of rejection under 35 USC 103.

Continuation of 5):

Applicant's rebuttal arguments filed April 7, 2003 averring that the unexpected duration of octyl ester have been considered, but are not found persuasive. As discussed in the previous office action, the partition coefficient of octyl ester is higher than that of hexyl ester (due to the longer carbon chain length), and therefore the duration, which the residing time in the body would be expected to be longer, because of the hydrophobicity of the compound.

Applicant's further arguments filed April 7, 2003 averring longer the carbon chain length, lesser the vasodilating efficacy of the compound would be. Examiner notes that the residing time of a drug sometimes may not be equivalent to its efficacy. Please note that between the time that a drug is administered and the time it reaches to the site of activity, it must diffuse through a variety of biological membranes. The major criterion in

Application/Control Number: 09/834,228

Art Unit: 1617

evaluation of the ability of a drug to penetrate these lipid membranes is its apparent oil/water partition coefficient (See Remington Pharmaceutical Sciences, a well-known pharmaceutical handbook, that one of ordinary skill in the art is charged to have possession, page 1680, col. 1). The balance between the activity and the partition coefficient always exist (See Remington, page 1680, Fig. 91-5). There is an optimum partition coefficient for a drug at which it most effectively permeates membranes and shows greatest activity. If the partition coefficients of the compounds are less than the optimum value, it will result in decrease in lipid solubility and the drug will remain localized in the first aqueous phase it contacts. If the partition coefficients of the compounds are larger than the optimum value, it will result in increase lipid solubility but it will not be able to partition out of the lipid membrane once it gets in, and/or it reaches the maximum solubility in the lipid portion of the membrane. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that when the carbon chain length is getting longer, the vasodilating effect diminished, as Applicant's demonstrated in the response filed April 7, 2003.

Since the proposed amendments will not be entered, the rejections set forth in the previous office action mailed November 20, 2002 remain.

No unanswered rebuttal arguments are seen to be present.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming. Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

Application/Control Number: 09/834,228

Art Unit: 1617

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, PhD., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

San-ming Hui April 24, 2003